



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,291	12/20/2006	Shigeaki Aoki	2006-0527A	4492

513 7590 02/23/2010
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
1030 15th Street, N.W.,
Suite 400 East
Washington, DC 20005-1503

EXAMINER

LAZORCIK, JASON L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1791

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

02/23/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
coa@wenderoth.com

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Date: February 11, 2010

Applicant was advised that the Takagi document discloses a glass composition comprising a helium concentration in the range of Applicants most preferred, disclosed concentration and manufactured by bubbling helium gas through a glass melt. Applicant was further advised that although Takagi does not disclose the isotopic ratio of He3 to He4 in the glass contained helium concentration, Aldrich makes plain that helium derived from natural gas sources (e.g. the most typical industrial source for helium gas) has a He3/He4 ratio approximately an order of magnitude less than that of atmospheric gas. Applicant was finally advised that, in view of Aldrich, it would appear evident that processing a glass melt by bubbling with He gas would inherently give rise to a He3/He4 ratio lower than that displayed by atmospheric gas or alternately that such a condition would be reasonably derived by a skilled practitioner through course of performing the Takagi disclosed process with typical, industrial sources of He gas.

Applicant was advised that the prior art does not teach nor reasonably suggest employing a measured value of the He3/He4 ratio as a means to exercise control over the glass manufacturing process. The Examiner indicated that 1) canceling claims 1-8 and 2) incorporating the limitations of claim 11 into independent claim 9 and adding a limitation which states, "and setting or changing a production condition for the glass article on the basis of the measured volume ratio" would place the application in condition for allowance. That is, no reference viewed alone nor in combination reasonably teaches nor suggests a method for manufacturing a glass article as recited in claims 9 and 11 whereby the process conditions are controlled responsive to a measured value of the volume isotope ratio of He3/He4.

Applicant's representative indicated that a response from Applicant regarding the proposed amendments would not be possible within the timeframe required by the Office. Applicant was advised that an Office Action corresponding to the above discussed prior art would be issued and Applicant was invited to contact the undersigned Examiner upon receipt and consideration of the prior art rejection.